

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

7 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 GREGORY D. JEFFREYS,

11 Defendant.

NO: CR-13-11-RMP  
CR-13-12-RMP

12 ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S  
13 MOTION FOR  
14 RECONSIDERATION

15 Before the Court is Defendant Gregory Jeffreys' motions for reconsideration  
16 of the Court's order in review of Mr. Jeffreys' orders of detention, ECF No. 53 and  
17 103, respectively. The Court has reviewed the motions, the responses, the Court's  
18 prior orders, the prior detention motion materials and orders, all other relevant  
19 filings, and is fully informed.

20 In this Court's order on review Magistrate Judge Imbrogno's order of  
detention, the Court found that no condition or combination of conditions could  
reasonably ensure Mr. Jeffreys' appearance or the safety of the community or any  
person. Mr. Jeffreys now moves the Court to reconsider its finding that no

1 combination of conditions could ensure community or individual safety. The  
2 Court's finding as to safety was supported in part by alleged threats made by Mr.  
3 Jeffreys against Dave Largent. Mr. Jeffreys has provided a newspaper article that  
4 reports that Mr. Largent was unaware of any threat against him. Mr. Jeffreys  
5 argues that given this new information, the Court should reverse its finding with  
6 regard to safety.

7 After considering the information contained in the newspaper article, the  
8 Court sees no reason to reconsider its finding as to the danger presented by Mr.  
9 Jeffreys to the community or any person. Testimony at the hearing supported the  
10 Court's findings as to the existence of threats against Mr. Largent. Even if those  
11 threats were never communicated to Mr. Largent himself, the evidence supports a  
12 finding of dangerousness.

13 Additionally, even if the Court were inclined to revise its dangerousness  
14 finding, detention is still supported by the Court's finding that no combination of  
15 conditions can reasonably ensure Mr. Jeffreys' appearance. Mr. Jeffreys  
16 challenges this finding in a conclusory fashion by stating that the jail telephone  
17 calls entered into the record "do not rise to the level supporting detention." Mr.  
18 Jeffreys proposes that a contempt citation is the appropriate remedy for any  
19 violations of Magistrate Judge Imbrogno's earlier orders. Mr. Jeffreys has  
20 provided no authority suggesting that this Court may not consider a defendant's

1 previous violations of court-imposed conditions when determining whether court-  
2 imposed conditions can reasonably ensure the appearance of that defendant. The  
3 Defendant's conclusory challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence provides no  
4 basis for reconsideration of the Court's April 1, 2013, ruling.

5 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

6 1. Defendant's motions for reconsideration, **ECF No. 53 and 103**, are

7 **DENIED.**

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9 The District Court Clerk is hereby directed to enter this Order and to provide  
10 copies to counsel.

11 **DATED** this 13th day of May 2013.

12  
13 s/ Rosanna Malouf Peterson  
14 ROSANNA MALOUF PETERSON  
15 Chief United States District Court Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20